HF Study Action Items
Week of February 6, 2011

Past Action Items

1. EPA provide ORD-TPM-3.4 standard
2. EPA provide glycol method for Region III lab (EPA provided information 02 FEB about the adaptation of a method but still awaiting method)
3. EPA provide definition of critical versus non-critical analytes *(EPA provided information on 03 FEB but we remain unclear as to the how the non-critical analyte analyses will be used)*
4. EPA to make a determination on potential for using ATGAS 2H investigation in its HF Study
5. EPA provide schedule (completed 02 FEB)
6. CHK provide lab SOPs (completed 27 JAN)
7. ~~CHK provide microseismic locations (completed 27 JAN, awaiting EPA decision on sufficiency, this is now obsolete as it pertains to the Haynesville site)~~
8. EPA provides CHK site criteria (02 FEB)
9. CHK provide EPA potential play locations (completed via email 1 FEB)
10. CHK re-provide schedule (completed via email 1 FEB)
11. ~~CHK to decide whether spud date may be moved on currently selected site (this action item has become obsolete as EPA's schedule of a November 2012 spud date cannot work at the Pre-selected Haynesville site)~~
12. EPA and CHK meet to discuss potential alternative sites (scheduled for this week – 07 FEB)

Outstanding Unresolved Issues

1. An approved project specific Quality Management Plan for the HF Study before work can begin and the QAPP finalized
2. A finalized and approved site specific QAPP (recognizing that it may need to be modified as additional information is learned over the course of the prospective study) – Site selection should not be the driving factor on this effort, Chesapeake believes this work could be going on now based on EPA knowing which labs will be utilized, analytes to be run, numbers of monitoring wells to be set, expected number of sampling events, descriptions of data evaluation and decision making processes at specific milestones, etc.
3. Placement of monitoring wells in proximity to the wellbore
4. Use of horizontal monitoring wells
5. Consideration of including USGS in site selection process